

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
TOWN OF LITCHFIELD**

Held on January 17, 2012

Minutes approved – 2/21/2012

The Litchfield Planning Board held a meeting in the Town Hall conference room 2 Liberty Way, Litchfield, NH 03052 on Wednesday, January 17, 2012 at 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Leon Barry (Chairman), Bob Curtis (Vice Chairman), Thomas Young, Frank Byron (Board of Selectmen Representative), Michael Croteau, Joel Kapelson, Alternate

MEMBERS ABSENT: Russell Blanchette, Barry Bean

ALSO PRESENT: Joan McKibben (Admin. Assistant), Jen Czysz (NRPC Senior Planner)

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Barry called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and joined the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

1. IMPACT FEE LANGUAGE UPDATE

Ms. Czysz handed out copies of what Mr. Wagner had previously drafted, plus a copy of other language which needs to be inserted into the updated document. She clarified the revised document would need to go before the Town Meeting to be finalized but will not go this year.

Mr. Byron provided a summary of where they had left off from his recollection for the benefit of Ms. Czysz. He provided the following information:

- There has been no re-examination of the original document
- No methodology had been determined for how impact fees will be assigned to anything new on the capital plan.
- Mr. Hoch has suggested the CIP should be updated every year
- Mr. Hoch and the Board of Selectmen can work on the CIP and provide information to the Planning Board to work on impact fees.

There was a discussion with respect to return of fees (page 6) on the draft ordinance; with Ms. Czysz suggesting this might be a simple change.

Ms. Czysz queried the status of 'E' (Summary of Recommendations) from Bruce Mayberry.

Mr. Barry stated he would like to find out how to incorporate the transfer station into the fees as it is new since Bruce Mayberry developed his recommendations. He asked Mr. Byron whether there are any other categories the Planning Board needs to consider, and in response Mr. Byron stated suggested using the CIP as a guide, but how to justify and set fees associated with each capital project will be a more difficult task. Mr. Barry suggested Ms.

1 Czysz follow up with Mr. Hoch to find out if any funds for 2011 have been assigned for
2 further development of fee schedules. He also stated a discussion will be necessary about
3 buildings and departments which are likely to require expansion.

4 **Action: Ms. Czysz**

5
6 There followed some discussion with respect to the items on the sheet handed out by Ms.
7 Czysz and why these areas need to be addressed.

8
9 Mr. Byron clarified there was a need to incorporate into the document how far an
10 organization can deviate from the purpose for which the fees were originally intended.

11
12 Referring to page 6, 1305 (b) Mr. Curtis questioned how returning fees can be tracked and
13 asked what happens if the Town is unable to find the original payer of the fees. Ms. Czysz
14 agreed to investigate and see what other communities have in place to see how they resolved
15 this issue. Mr. Byron suggested looking at the Town of Hudson.

16 **Action: Ms. Czysz**

17
18 Ms. Czysz agreed to do more research on the CIP and link it to the Impact Fee Ordinance.

19 **Action: Ms. Czysz**

20
21 The Board then went through the recommendations and status from the Bruce Mayberry
22 report as follows (refer to report for item details):

23
24 *Summary recommendations in italic from Mayberry report:*

25
26 *Review all applicable impact fee facility standards with respect to actual potential for*
27 *implementation relative to long-term growth needs. Consider the "deficiency" implication*
28 *of the chosen standards relative to current demands. Adoption of standards that are more*
29 *commensurate with the facilities that the Town actually provides or is likely to provide will*
30 *result in a more balanced impact fee system.*

- 31
32 1. Mr. Byron stated they need to be realistic with respect to what the Town can really do in
33 a six year period and there followed a discussion on this. Ms. Czysz obtained
34 confirmation that the CIP prioritizes projects.

35
36 *Develop revised estimates of development costs per square foot for improvements involving*
37 *public buildings. Cost should include not only building construction, but architecture and*
38 *engineering, site work, and land acquisition where necessary to reflect full development*
39 *cost.*

- 40 2. In response to a query from Ms. Czysz, Mr. Byron confirmed Mr. Wagner had worked
41 on this but there is currently a disconnection (as other things need to be incorporated).
42 Mr. Byron asked about the Litchfield build out study and when it was last completed. He
43 stated this could be to Mr. Barry's question with respect to when is it decided not to
44 collect any more fees for a particular project.

1
2 *Identify the cost to rectify identified deficiencies under the selected standard, and determine*
3 *how that deficiency will be funded (using revenue other than impact fees).*
4

- 5 3. There was a discussion on existing deficiencies and how to fund them (not through
6 impact fees).
7

8 *Recreation standards within the impact fee system appear to differ substantially from those*
9 *developed in the 2002 Master Plan. Consider recalculating the fees at the Master Plan*
10 *standard, which will reduce the current year "deficiency" estimates.*
11

12 *Review the cost per facility assigned to recreation facilities. In particular, the derivation of*
13 *the standard and cost for the paved bike trails that comprise a large part of the fee, need to*
14 *be documented and compared with actual improvements to date and future plans. If some*
15 *share of the cost of paved bike trails has been supported by Federal funds, the capital basis*
16 *should be adjusted to reflect the cost per mile borne by the Town.*
17

- 18 4. Mr. Byron pointed out a new field is being built therefore how much can the fees be
19 reduced.

20 Responding to a query from Mr. Barry on maintenance of culverts Mr. Byron reported
21 the existing ones are paid for by appropriation and not impact fees. There was a
22 discussion on the types of things which would not be addressed by impact fees.
23

24 *Limit the scope of the road impact fee to major roads maintained by the Town that serve as*
25 *local arterials, collectors or feeder roads. Compare the cost assumptions assigned to road*
26 *surface area or per linear foot of roadway in the impact fee formula to the actual annual*
27 *investments the Town is making periodically in its central road system.*
28

- 29 5. There was a discussion with respect to traffic. Ms. Czysz asked how fees for roads are
30 set and whether they are collected based on total road lineage. Ms. Czysz agreed to look
31 into this.

32 *The road impact fee table could be updated using more recent trip generation data. The*
33 *current fee schedule reflects trip rates from the 4th edition of ITE's Trip Generation (published in*
34 *1987). The 8th edition (2008) is now available.*
35

- 36 6. Ms. Czysz reported Mr. Wagner highlighted that a change needs to be made in the
37 ordinance with respect to this.

38 *Review long-term school district plans to assure that facility capacity will be adequately*
39 *available to support needs of new development; at a minimum, recalculate the fees using*
40 *updated enrollment multipliers and capacity estimates, particularly as final plan are*
41 *developed for a new elementary school.*
42

- 43 7. Planning Board decided to leave the existing fee there (as the Board of Selectmen
44 disagreed with the Planning Board's decision to remove fees for the new elementary
45 school).
46

1
2 *Consider assessing the school impact fee for all grade levels including middle school*
3 *capacity.*

4 8. Mr. Byron made the point that there is now a state requirement for Kindergarten which
5 may impact this item more. Ms. Czysz agreed to obtain clarification of what Mr.
6 Mayberry meant by this item.

7
8 *The town has been collecting impact fees since as early as 191-1992. For some fee*
9 *categories, it is unclear whether the capital cost basis assumed in the fee calculations has*
10 *been matched by actual improvements of similar quantity or cost.*

11 9. Is additional reporting required?

12
13 *Refunds may be due for some facilities in cases where the Town or School District did not*
14 *appropriate the necessary non-impact fee share of funds needed to create the capital*
15 *facilities for which the fee was assessed within a reasonable period of time.*

16 10. This item is currently under control.

17
18 *The Town could consolidate the two impact fee ordinances into a single article of the zoning*
19 *ordinance.*

20 11. There was a discussion with respect to the advantages of doing this (i.e. it is easier for
21 administrative updates).

22 **Action: Ms. Czysz**

23
24 There was a discussion on the list of outstanding projects. Ms. Czysz also reported an
25 additional item (from the Board of Selectmen) with respect to changing the zoning in the
26 northern part of town and there was a discussion with respect to the type of zoning currently in
27 the north end. Mr. Byron suggested making it more industrial/commercial and to obtain an
28 understanding of Londonderry zoning of land which abuts Litchfield. It was suggested this
29 should be priority # 2 on the Board's list of projects for 2012.

30
31 Mr. Barry suggested workforce housing should be # 1.

32
33 Mr. Barry stated there was a lack of understanding with respect to the impact on the Town of
34 storm water management, and Ms. Czysz explained there is a new federal standard coming
35 down the line. She agreed to ascertain where the Town falls within the new tier system and she
36 provided an explanation of the impact of additional storm water run off.

37
38 Mr. Barry asked for input from the Board with respect to its priorities for 2012.

39
40 In response to a request from Mr. Barry, Ms. Czysz explained agricultural protection is an
41 undefined item which the Board can work through with the primary objective of creating a
42 zoning district in Town which is agricultural friendly. Mr. Croteau reported to Ms. Czysz that
43 the Board had discussed the possibility of up a heritage district, and Mr. Byron reported there
44 have been sub committee reports on agriculture and studies with respect to conservation land.

1 It was agreed the Board should address storm water management at its next meeting, and Ms.
2 Czysz should obtain basic information for the Board.

3
4 **2. WORK FORCE HOUSING & MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING**

5
6 A discussion took place with respect to possibly setting up a sub committee to deal with
7 workforce housing which could assist the Board with its priorities and Ms. Czysz made
8 some recommendations relative to the sub committee. Mr. Barry agreed to report back at
9 the next meeting once he has touched base with Selectman Perry who had offered to chair
10 the sub committee, and Ms. Czysz offered to have a contact she has present on workforce
11 housing to the Board.

12 **Action: Ms. Czysz / Mr. Barry**

13 Mr. Barry suggested the hearings for workforce housing should take place early.

14
15 **3. 2012-2013 GRANT PROGRAMS FOR DEVELOPING ORDINANCES**

16 Ms. Czysz reported on new grants which have been awarded to the Nashua Regional
17 Planning Commission and the NH Housing Commission. She provided details of what they
18 will be used for. There was a discussion with respect to parts of the grants to be used for
19 zoning and sustainable communities and workforce housing resources.

20
21 **4. APPROVE MINUTES**

22 **MOTION:** by Mr. Curtis

23 *Move to approve the minutes of the Litchfield Planning Board meeting on December 20,*
24 *2011 as amended.*

25 **SECOND:** Mr. Young

26 In response to a request from Mr. Barry, Mr. Kapelson agreed to be a voting member of the
27 Committee for the evening.

28 **VOTE:** 6-0-0

29 **The motion carried unanimously.**

30
31 **MOTION:** by Mr. Curtis

32 *Move to approve the minutes of the Litchfield Planning Board meeting on January 4,*
33 *2012 as written*

34 **SECOND:** Mr. Young

35 **VOTE:** 5-0-1 (Mr. Kapelson abstained)

36 **The motion carried.**

37
38 **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

39 Ms. McKibben stated there was a case for a lot line adjustment being processed currently
40 and she asked whether the fee amount could go down to \$2,500. It was agreed Ms. Czysz
41 should take a look at the case and determine whether it will be necessary to go to the Town
42 engineer and then determine whether to reduce the fee to \$2,500. The case will be heard at
43 the Board's meeting on February 7, 2012.

44
45 **MOTION:** by Mr. Curtis

46 *Move to adjourn*

SECOND: Mr. Croteau

VOTE: 6-0-0

The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Leon Barry, Chairman

Bob Curtis, Vice Chairman

Frank Byron, Selectman

Barry Bean

Michael Croteau

Thomas R. Young

Russell Blanchette

Minutes taken by: *Sandra Maxwell, Recording Secretary*